

## UNITED STATES ARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231.

APPLICATION NUMBER FIRST NAMED APPLICANT FILING DATE

08/675.572

07/03/96

WOOLFOAD

M

3616.20USC1

C5M1/1129

MERCHANI GOULD SMITH EDELL WELTER AND SCHMIDT 3100 NORWEST CENTER 90 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

EXAMINER

TAYLOR, D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3506 DATE MAILED:

11/29/96

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMM	ARY	
Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .		
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 D.C. 11, 453 O.C.	, prosecution as to the merita is cloaed in 3. 213.	
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to re the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time r 1.136(a).	spond within the period for response will cause	
Disposition of Claims		
☑ Claim(s) 1 × 30 − 49	is/are pending in the application.	
Of the above, claim(s)		
☐ Claim(s)	is/are allowed	
Claim(s) 1 + 30 - 49	is/are rejected.	•
☐ Claim(s)		
Claims	are subject to restriction or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9	948.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed onis	/are objected to by the Examiner.	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on		
The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	•	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d).	
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority doc	uments have been BEST AVAILABLE O	OPY
☐ received.		
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)		
$\square$ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
*Certified copies not received:		
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	·	
Attachment(s)		
☐ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892	7	
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).	_ =	
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413	,	
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948		
Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO 153		

-- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES --

PTOL-326 (Rev. 10/95)

-2-

Serial Number: 08/675,572

Art Unit: 3506

## Part III DETAILED ACTION

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1 and 30-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mazzaress (U.S. 4,565,043) in view of Gravier (U.S. 4,909,010). With respect to claims 1 and 30, to have arranged the flange 28 of Mazzaress so as to extend across the entire back surface of the block 18, as taught by Gravier for flange 17a, would have been an obvious expedient to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by Gravier, that it is desirable to arrange a flange across the entire back surface of a block because the flange would be stronger and less likely to be broken. Also, the particular

Serial Number: 08/675,572 -3-

Art Unit: 3506

shape of the side faces is considered to be a matter of design choice which would be obvious to one skilled in the art and not a patentable distinction because there is nothing recited in the claims that gives any significance to the shape of the side surfaces. Claims 31-49 are directed to the particular shape of the block and therefore, are not considered to constitute patentable distinctions because various design shapes would be obvious to one skilled in the art. Moreover, as set forth above for claims 1 and 30, the particular shape of the various surfaces of the block are considered to be a matter of design choice which would be obvious to one skilled in the art and not a patentable distinction because there is nothing recited in the claims that gives any significance to the shape of the surfaces.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Taylor whose **telephone number is (703) 308-1013.** The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tamara Graysay, can be reached on (703) 308-2144. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3597 or 305-3598.

Serial Number: 08/675,572

Art Unit: 3506

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is  $(703)\ 308-2168$ .

DENNIS L TAYLOR PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 3506

November 25, 1996. (6) 675572.1st

-4-